REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7 are pending and stand rejected. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1 – 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as the Examiner asserts that these claims are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,493,755 to Hansen et al. (referred to as herein as "Hansen").

Claim 1, as previously presented, includes the recitation of "means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy prerequirement rule sets." As described in the disclosure of the present application at, for example, page 3, third paragraph , a higher-level log is generated as a result of combinations of certain lower-level logs being received. As an example, if there is a predetermined rule set for lower-level logs A then B then C, when lower-level logs A then B then C are received, a higher-level log is generated and commands that are associated with that higher-level log are executed.

According to the teachings of Hansen, network management software 14 monitors the status of various network devices and an administrator 20 is able to configure the notification function provided by the management software to limit notification, or device status reporting to only those instances in which a network event occurs. Hansen specifically discloses that "a network event represents a change in status of a device being monitored." Hansen further discloses that "to achieve this notification for specific network occurrences, the network administrator 20 configures

-2-

the network management software 14 by defining a set of event conditions that describe the particular state upon which notification will occur. Therefore, the network management software 14 <u>allows the user or network administrator 20 to receive notification of certain preselected events</u> that occur on the network."

As such, Hansen teaches limiting notification or status reporting to only certain "network events." Network events refer only to a change in status of a device being monitored. There is no teaching or suggestion of two different status logs being received, in response to which a higher level log is generated. Instead, Hansen teaches filtering notification or status reports so that only specific, predefined status changes in a device are reported. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion anywhere in the Hansen reference of higher-level logs being generated in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy predetermined rule sets, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In asserting that Hansen teaches this recitation, the Examiner relies on column 4, lines 20-24 and lines 56-64. These portions of the cited reference, however, are completely devoid of any teaching of <u>two different status logs</u> being received and in response, generating a higher level log.

Claim 4 recites <u>inter alia</u>, "providing rule sets that are satisfied by receipt of particular combinations of at least two different status logs and when satisfied, result in

the generation of higher level logs." Claim 4 is believed to be patentably distinguished from Hansen for the reasons given.

Claims 2-3 and 6 depend upon claim 1 and claims 5 and 7 depend upon claim 4. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the above reasons given for the independent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the application including claims 1 – 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889

FC/pg